DataSlicer: Task-Based Data Selection For Visual Data Exploration

Farid Alborzi, Rada Chirkova, Pallavi Deo, Christopher Healey, Gargi Pingale, Vaira Selvakani
North Carolina State University, USA
Email: {falborz,rychirko,psdeo, healey,gpingal,vbselvak}@ncsu.edu

Juan Reutter
Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile
Email: jreutter@ing.puc.cl

Surajit Chaudhuri
Microsoft Research, USA
Email: surajitc@microsoft.com

arXiv:1703.09218v1 [cs.DB] 27 Mar 2017

***Abstract*—In visual exploration and analysis of data, determining how to select and transform the data for visualization is a challenge for data-unfamiliar or inexperienced users. Our main hypothesis is that for many data sets and common analysis tasks, there are relatively few "data slices" that result in effective visualizations. By focusing human users on appropriate and suitably transformed parts of the underlying data sets, these data slices can help the users carry their task to correct completion.**

To verify this hypothesis, we develop a framework that permits us to capture exemplary data slices for a user task, and to explore and parse visual-exploration sequences into a format that makes them distinct and easy to compare. We develop a recommendation system, DataSlicer, that matches a "currently viewed" data slice with the most promising "next effective" data slices for the given exploration task. We report the results of controlled experiments with an implementation of the DataSlicer system, using four common analytical task types. The experiments demonstrate statistically significant improvements in accuracy and exploration speed versus users without access to our system.

I. Introduction

Data-intensive systems accompanied by visualization software are being increasingly used for interactive data explorations [26], [27], [20], [23], [29], [19], [28]. These and other systems help data analysts in their exploratory tasks of visually identifying trends, patterns, and outliers of interest. The visualizations make it more efficient to find task-relevant types of objects in exploratory data analysis, especially in presence of large data. The reason is, visualizations allow analysts to leverage their visual pattern-matching skills, domain expertise, knowledge of context, and ability to manage ambiguity in ways that fully automated systems cannot.

Due to the exploratory nature of their tasks, analysts often face a wide variety of visualization options to choose from. As pointed out in [29], it is not the visualization per se that is the main challenge. Indeed, once the data to visualize have been selected and transformed (e.g., grouped and aggregated in an appropriate way), users can take advantage of a visualization tool to provide an effective visual presentation of the resulting data. In this paper we look into exploratory data analysis under the assumption that we have access to such *presentation* solutions, and focus instead on the issue of determining which "data slices" would be the most helpful to the user in addressing the task at hand when visualized. Here, the term *data slice* refers to the outcome of the process of selecting the data of interest from the given data set, as well as potentially transforming (e.g., grouping and aggregating) the selected data.

Identifying the data slices that are appropriate for the given task is a challenge for inexperienced users or those not familiar with the data at hand. The reason is that, typically, only a small fraction of the available data slices results in task-relevant visualizations, while all the other options fails to help the user with her task. This may force such users to examine a large number of options, to find those that lead to relevant visualizations for their exploration or analysis task. While clearly a challenge in presence of large-scale data, this is a hard problem even when the data set is small.

Our Focus: Our focus is on analytical tasks of common interest, such as detection of outliers or trends, that users often perform in visual exploratory analysis of data. Our objective is to improve the user experience by suggesting to her those data slices that, when visualized, present correct solutions to her task in a prominent way. Solving this problem would be instrumental in helping casual or inexperienced users to effectively conduct explorations of potentially unfamiliar data sets, in a number of application domains and for a spectrum of exploration objectives. For our study, we assume that a user begins work by declaring the task that she plans to perform. We also assume that she is able to identify a correct solution for her task (e.g., an outlier) when the solution is presented to her prominently in a visualization of some data slice.

Proposed Solution: We address the combinatorial explosion in data-slice selection by basing data-slice suggestions on the stage at which the user is in solving her task, and (when available) on expert knowledge of the domain, task, and data set. In this emphasis on, and appreciation of, expert knowledge in solving complex data problems, our effort is in line with the research directions such as that of DeepDive [22], [25].

As an illustration, consider a relation storing the data from [5] (see [16] for the details) on major earthquakes worldwide from 1900–2013. The data set has 17 attributes and 8289 data points, please see Fig. 1(a) for a fragment of the data.

Suppose that in that data set, the *user task* is to find locations in Central America containing earthquakes that are outliers based on magnitude. In this user task, there is a wide range of options when selecting the initial data to be visualized. One natural starting point in the exploration would be to examine a map showing locations and other information about the earthquakes in the data set. One such visualization is shown in Fig. 1(b). The key point to note is that this visualization is unlikely to be helpful to those users who are not familiar

Place	AVG of Dep.	AVG of Mag.	NUM. of Rec.
Guadeloupe	100.0	7.4	1
Antigua and Barbuda	16.9	6.6	4
Martinique	102.0	7.0	3
East of Dominica	11.2	7.2	1

(a) A fragment of the data set [5]



(b) A visualization using dimensions *average magnitude* (of earthquakes at location), *number of earthquakes* (at location), and *depth* (of earthquake)



(c) A visualization using only the *average magnitude* dimension (bigger circles represent greater average magnitude)

Fig. 1. Visual exploration (part 1) in search of earthquake-magnitude outliers in Central America using data set [5], please see experimental task 1 in Section VII. The arrows in (b) and (c) highlight the visualizations of the "Guadeloupe" data point shown in (a); this data point is one of the answers to task 1.



(a) A visualization using the *average magnitude* dimension (darker tones represent greater magnitude)



(b) Box plot showing outlier values of average earthquake magnitude



(c) A visualization showing the answers (magnitude-outlier earthquake locations) prominently on the map

Fig. 2. Visual exploration (part 2) in search of earthquake magnitude outliers in Central America using data set [5], please see experimental task 1 in Section VII. The sequence (b)–(c) is an expert solution to the task. The arrows in (a) and (c) highlight the "Guadeloupe" answer data point, please see Fig. 1.

with the data set. For instance, the arrow in Fig. 1(b) is pointing to one correct answer (Guadeloupe in Fig. 1(a)) for this exploration task; observe that the visualization is not conducive to finding that answer, as the data point in question does not stand out in the visualization.

One explanation for the relative ineffectiveness of the visualization of Fig. 1(b) for the task at hand is that Fig. 1(b) shows not only the location and magnitude, but also other information about each earthquake. Suppose the analyst eliminates those features of the data that are irrelevant to the task at hand; the resulting visualization could be as in Fig. 1(c) or 2(a).[1] Interestingly and perhaps counterintuitively, we have found that these visualizations are not very helpful either to human viewers performing this task on the data set [5], again because the answers do not all stand out visually.

A more effective way to address this exploratory task is for the user to first examine a box plot showing the earthquake-magnitude mean and outlier whiskers; please see Fig. 2(b) for the visualization. Once the cutoff value for outlier earthquake magnitude has been found, the user can effectively construct a correct answer for her task by filtering out the irrelevant data. The result is visualized in Fig. 2(c).

The data slice depicted in Fig. 2(b) is not related to the data slices used to construct Figures 1(b)–2(a). The difference goes beyond removing irrelevant data features and, in fact, represents a drastically different choice of both the *data dimensions* and of their *grouping layout*. We found that if a user is unable to find a data slice that would present prominently the outlier values of earthquake magnitude in the data set, then suggesting to her the data slice (and the straightforward visual presentation) of Fig. 2(b) would typically enable her to proceed efficiently to constructing the data slice of Fig. 2(c). Moreover, if the user is not sure how to proceed even after examining Fig. 2(b), then she should find the data slice (and the map presentation) of Fig. 2(c) a helpful suggestion for the final stage of her overall task.

In our experiments with this data set and user task (task 1 in Section VII), we found that for humans looking for earthquake-magnitude outliers for the first time, it is not trivial to come up with an effective first-step visualization such as the box plot of Fig. 2(b). Moreover, even though the data set [5] has relatively few (17) data attributes, it is impractical to enumerate all the possible data slices by brute force, in the hope of eventually identifying and visualizing a useful choice such as the data in Fig. 2(b). Indeed, a seemingly natural but suboptimal choice of the initial visualization to look at — such as those in Figures 1(b)–2(a) — is not necessarily conducive to finding the answers to the exploration task in question. While clearly a challenge in presence of large-scale data, this effect may be present even in those cases where the data sets are small by today's measures. (Recall that the earthquakes data set [5] has 8289 records.) Note that relatively minor ("local") modifications of initially suboptimal data choices to visualize, such as in the transition between Figures 1(b)–1(c), do not necessarily make the resulting visualization any more helpful to the user than the previous choice.

The *main hypothesis* put forth in this paper is that for many data sets and common exploratory-analysis tasks, there are relatively few data slices that are key to providing effective visualizations for the task. Intuitively, these data slices are manifestations of the domain and data-set knowledge that is relevant to the task at hand. As we argue in this paper and corroborate with our preliminary experiments (see Section VII), the data-slice choices made by domain experts may help other

[1]The difference between Figures 1(c) and 2(a) is just in the visual representation of the values of earthquake magnitude.

users of the data set solve similar exploration/analysis tasks in a more correct and efficient fashion. To substantiate and verify these claims, we use the specific measures (as in, e.g., [13], [14]) of: *result accuracy,* understood as the average number of correct solutions found, and of *user efficiency (speed),* understood as the average number of data-specification steps taken to find a correct visualization for the task.

Significant advances have been made lately in developing visual solutions for data exploration and analysis. Major projects, including those described in [4], [2], [8], [29], [23], [30], focus on determining which data slices could be useful to human viewers when visualized. (We provide an overview of these projects in Section II.) Typically, data slices in these and other projects are suggested to the users based on generic expectations about what a user might find interesting in the data, rather than on the context of a particular task that the user might be facing, or of the user's stage in solving the task. Thus, to the best of our understanding, the solutions in the literature still fail to solve the problem of how to efficiently lead casual or inexperienced human users to visualizations of the data that summarize in an effective and prominent way the data points of interest for the user's exploratory-analysis task. As observed via the preliminary experiments reported in this paper, solving two distinct visual-exploration/analysis tasks on the *same* data set may lead to distinct sequences of data slices, with the data slices in each sequence being of value in the context, and perhaps at the specific stage, of just one of these tasks but not the other. (Please see the discussion of experimental tasks 3 and 4 in Section VII.) In addition, to the best of our knowledge, suggesting (sequences of) data slices that would be helpful in solving at least one of these tasks, that of *determining trends in the data,* cannot be done using state-of-the-art tools.

The specific contributions that we report are as follows:

- We develop a formal framework for capturing data slices of interest in a given class of visual-exploration tasks, and for providing appropriately visualized user-specific modifications of each data slice. The data structures in the framework are scalable in the size of the data set, and typically do not need to be modified as the contents of the data set change over time.
- We develop prediction software that matches a "currently viewed" data slice with the most promising "next effective" data slice for the given type of exploration task on the data.
- We implement our framework and prediction system, DataSlicer, in tandem with commercial visualization software.
- Finally, we provide results from controlled experiments with 48 volunteers. The experiments demonstrate, for four common types of visual-analysis tasks, statistically significant improvements in accuracy and exploration speed versus users without access to our system.

Organization: After reviewing related work in Section II, we present our framework in Section III. Section IV outlines our main algorithms, and Section V describes construction of our data structures. The architecture of the DataSlicer system is discussed in Section VI. Section VII reports the experimental results, and Section VIII concludes.

II. Related Work

Significant advances have been made lately in developing various facets of visual solutions for data exploration and analysis. In this space, we focus mainly on projects that concentrate on the problem of finding the right visualization, e.g., [2], [23], [29], [30]. We refer the reader to the survey [15] for a more general discussion of data-exploration techniques.

The system architecture in this current project is based on the connection between SQL queries and visualizations, which is at the core of commercial tools such as Tableau [16], [27]. Our data-slice format, as detailed in Section IV-A, has been inspired by, and is similar to, the formalization of visualizations provided in [27]. At the same time, the main purpose of that formalization in [27] is for the visualization system to keep track of the current visualization, as it is being actively managed by the user, rather than by the system itself. In this current paper, the main purpose of the data-slice format is to match the user's current visualization with the stored past visualizations, and to recommend back to the user the best "next-step" data slice for her visualization sequence.

As in [10], [11], we view the task of constructing visualizations as a two-step process: One first decides on the data slice that is to be shown, and then chooses an appropriate visual specification for this data slice. Several projects, including [10], [11], [12], have focused in this space on (semi) automatic recommendation of the best visual specification for a given task and data slice. However, the built-in assumption in those projects is that the appropriate data slice has been chosen. Our work is orthogonal to these efforts, in that we aim at choosing the best data slice, and assume that the visual specifications are given. We expect to be able to combine forces in the future, to create a system that can help users to select both the appropriate data and the best presentation.

Regarding the problem of choosing the appropriate data slice, the first connection that comes to mind is the problem of choosing the adequate SQL query for a given task. This problem has received substantial attention in the database community (see, e.g., [9], [18], [3]). At the same time, our work is more closely related to those projects that focus on learning which data need to be presented using a visual interface, rather than on constructing directly the appropriate SQL query. Here we have systems such as Vizdeck [17] and Charles [24], which aim to recommend the best visualization based on statistical properties of the data. There are also systems that recommend visualizations based on the user feedback [2], [4], [8]. The system called SeeDB [29], [23] automatically generates "interesting visualizations" based on those data slices where the trend deviates in a statistically significant way from the trend on the overall data set. Further, [30] describes a vision of an automated system, which can explore past user decisions with the goal of discovering further operations on the data of potential interest to the same user.

In this current project, our overall goal is the same as in the above papers. At the same time, instead of aiming for a fully automatic generic tool for selecting potentially popular individual data slices, we focus on choosing data slices that best address a given visualization-based *task.* As a result, the data slices selected by our system are task dependent, rather than just data-set dependent, and are also not limited to statistically interesting data. (For an illustration of how our system provides task-dependent, rather than data-dependent, recommendations, see Section VII for experimental tasks 3 and 4 performed on the *same* data set.) Further, we work with the hypothesis that previous users, when faced with *the same type* of task, could guide the system as to which data slices (or sequences thereof), with their visualizations, are interesting

for the current user. In its emphasis on domain knowledge for the given task and data set, our approach is in line with research directions such as that of DeepDive [22], [25]. As a result, our approach can suggest to users data slices, such as those showing general trends on the data, that state-of-the-art systems cannot recommend to the best of our knowledge. (See discussion of experimental task 4 in Section VII.)

Finally, a good example of a collaborative tool for visualizing data is AstroShelf [21]. This tool is specifically tailored for astrophysicists and, unlike ours, aims more at facilitating collaborations than recommending visualizations.

III. The Framework: An Overview

In this section we describe the envisioned user experience with a visualization-enabled system, where the system would advance the user's task-solving process by suggesting task-relevant data slices from the underlying data. We then outline our proposed approach to delivering such an experience.

A. The Intended User Experience

When presented with a visual-exploration or visual-analysis task, users need to make decisions on which data to visualize to solve the task. The default approach is for the user to construct various visualizations directly in a visualization tool, and to then keep improving or replacing them until one or more visualizations that are effective for the task are found. This can be time- and resource-consuming (cf. [29]). Our goal is to alleviate or eliminate the inefficiencies in solving the data-selection part of the user's visual-analysis task.

Our proposed system is designed to serve as a back-end of a standalone visualization tool. At any given time in working on the task, users may ask the system to suggest visualizations that would be useful for solving the task. If so requested, the system would analyze the current user's session and would recommend an (appropriately visualized) data slice based on the history of previous users who were involved in solving similar tasks. When analyzing the sequences of previous users, the system would assign higher priority to those data slices that were labeled by previous users as *interesting*; for instance, a data slice is considered interesting if past users spent a considerable amount of time looking at its visualization(s).

Consider, for example, the task of finding earthquake-magnitude outliers in Central America using the data set [5], as presented in Section I. A user may start her work on this task by constructing a visualization of Fig. 1(b) or of Fig. 2(a). If she is overwhelmed by the amount of potentially relevant information in the visualizations, she would ask the system for a recommendation. The system would then analyze the user's current data slice, and would determine that the most successful past sequences involving the data slice of Fig. 2(a) would next switch to the data slice whose fragment is shown in Fig. 2(b), and then to that whose fragment is shown in Fig. 2(c). The two latter data slices, in that order and augmented by the current session's filtering conditions (Central America), would end up being chosen for the user. The system would determine appropriate visualizations for the recommended data slices by either using the user's visualization preferences in her current session or (if not available) by rules in the system. For the framework and system introduced in this paper, the claim of this example is corroborated by our experimental results, please see a discussion of experimental task 1 in Section VII.

B. The Proposed Approach: Data Sequences via Graphs

Our proposed framework and system are designed to work with users who create sequences of appropriately visualized data slices. A sequence could be exploratory, with the user trying to determine which individual (single) data slice works best for addressing her current task. Alternatively, a sequence could be part of a solution that calls for construction of multiple consecutive data slices, as in the earthquake-magnitude task of Sections I and III-A. Either way, we use the graph representation to encode all the sequences of data slices for a type of task on a data set; we call the resulting graph the *data-slice graph* for this task type and data set. In a data-slice graph, nodes encode data slices, together with any appropriate visualizations, and directed edges encode transitions between consecutive data slices in past user sessions.

When users ask for recommendations, our system *matches* their current session with the information stored in the data-slice graph, based on node similarity. Our approach can use any algorithm for measuring similarity between nodes; please see Section IV-B for a specific instantiation. The system then recommends to the user those data slices that were the most helpful, at the matched point in the graph, to previous users working on tasks of the same type. Again, our approach can use any algorithm for determining whether a node is helpful — *interesting* — enough to a user. (For instance, in our experiments we considered a data slice interesting if its visualization had been examined by at least one user for an amount of time above a fixed threshold.) To enable the recommendation feature, each node in the data-slice graph is marked as either "interesting" or "not interesting."

The number of data slices that one could construct using a data set with even a few attributes may be prohibitively large for computational purposes. It may not be practical or even feasible to represent and store all the possibilities explicitly. Instead, since our goal is to present the user with a specific data slice, we manipulate abstractions from visualizations using the relational model, similarly to what was done in [27].

More precisely, we map each data slice to a (simplified) relational-algebra expression, and work with relational queries. We store as nodes in a data-slice graph only those relational-algebra expressions that were featured in at least one sequence executed for the same type of task on the data set at hand by at least one previous user.

The data-slice graph contains all the information that we need to recommend data slices to the user: Once we match the user's current data slice to a node in the graph, it suffices to look for those interesting nodes in the graph that are "downstream closest" to the matched node. Intuitively, this amounts to finding the next interesting nodes in previous sequences that feature a data slice similar to that of the current user. In the next two sections we provide details on the construction of the data-slice graph, how the matching is done, and how we look for the closest interesting nodes.

IV. The DataSlicer System

In this section we describe the DataSlicer framework and system. We start with a description of our theoretical framework for specifying sequences of data slices and their accompanying visualizations. We then discuss how the framework stores sequences in a data-slice graph, and explain how this graph is used to recommend to users data slices for addressing their task on the data set.

A. Data-Slice Sequences and Graphs

We represent each visual depiction of data as a tuple $Vis = \langle D, S \rangle$. Here, D is the *data specification*, which contains the information on the data slice in the visual depiction. Further, S is the *visual specification*, with information regarding how the data slice is to be visually presented, including the type of visualization (e.g., box plot or pie chart), colors, shapes, and so on. Consider, for instance, Fig. 1(b), which visualizes information on earthquakes in Central America. To create this visualization, we first need the latitude and longitude for each observation in the data set; this will tell us how to place each observation on the map. Fig. 1(b) also shows three additional attributes for each observation point: the *average magnitude*, the *number of records,* and the *average depth* of the earthquakes. Each attribute is shown using a different visual cue: We use the dot color to represent magnitude, the dot size to represent the number of records, and the dot label for the average earthquake depth. The visualization terminology for each of these attributes is a *layer*; in general, each layer is assigned a different visual cue.

Thus, the *data* specification D for Fig. 1(b) will state which information to extract about the data points to be shown: the latitude, longitude, magnitude, number of records, and depth, see Fig. 3. The *visual* specification S for Fig. 1(b) states that the visualization needs to show the map of Central America, that each data point is to be shown as a dot, and what visual cue is assigned to each of the layers: color for average magnitude, size for number of records, and label for average depth.

Our data-specification format has been inspired by, and is similar to, the formal definition of visualizations provided in [27]. (Please see Section II for a discussion of the difference between [27] and this project in the use of the formalism.) Similarly to [27], [29], we assume that the data to be specified come from a single relational table.[2] To define a data specification on a relation R, the following information is required:

1. The fields applicable to the data set. These are either attributes of R (called *simple fields),* or *complex fields* formed by combining two or more fields using the operations of concatenation ($+$), cross product ($\times$), and nesting ($/$) [27]. We also allow aggregation over simple and/or complex fields, using operators `SUM`, `MIN`, `MAX`, or `AVG`.

2. How the data from these fields are extracted. This amounts to specifying how the data are being grouped and which filters are currently active. Here we also provide information about which fields are being mapped to the visual axes `X` and `Y`, and about what fields are being rendered as layers.

As an example of a data specification, consider again the visualization in Fig. 1(b). In this data specification, `X` corresponds to longitude, `Y` to latitude, and there are three layers: `AVG`(magnitude), `SUM`(number of records) and `AVG`(depth). We also need to mention that the data are being grouped by the value of "place." (The attribute "place" is a standard construct included in geographical data sets; it is used to group the data points by their geographical location.) The full data specification for Fig. 1(b) is shown in Fig. 3.

Formally, a *data specification* is a tuple (X, Y, Layers, Filters, Grouping), where X and Y are the fields rendered respectively as the `X` and `Y` axis, Layers is the set of fields rendered as layers, Filters is the set of filters in use, and Grouping is the set of attributes used for grouping. Continuing with our example, the data specification for Fig. 1(b) is *(lon, lat, { AVG (mag), SUM (nr), AVG (de) }, pl, -).*

simple fields:	lon (= longitude), lat (= latitude), pl (= place), mag (= magnitude), nr (= number of records), de (= depth)
complex fields:	–
X Axis	lon
Y Axis	lat
Layers:	AVG (mag), SUM (nr), AVG (de)
Grouping:	pl
Filters:	–

Fig. 3. The data specification for the visualization of Fig. 1(b).

A data specification is a SQL-query template of the form[3]

```
SELECT <fields to be displayed>
FROM <data set>
WHERE <filters on nonaggregated fields>
GROUP BY <grouping specification, X and Y axis>
HAVING <filters on aggregated fields>
```

The connection between data specifications and SQL is important, as it provides flexibility when communicating with the log of visualization systems: We can either capture their data specifications, or we can capture SQL queries and produce specifications ourselves. For our example, the query is

```
SELECT latitude, longitude, AVG(magnitude),
       SUM(number of records), AVG(depth)
FROM Earthquakes
WHERE latitude < 49.5 AND latitude > 5.3 AND
     longitude < -24.5 AND longitude > -128.7
GROUP BY place
```

The Navigation Algebra: We now specify operations on data specifications. The purpose is to enable transitions from one data specification to the next in a visual-exploration sequence that a user generates on the data. The basic operations for transforming data specifications are as follows:

- Add or remove a filter condition;
- Add or remove a field to/from the `SELECT` condition (that is, the fields rendered as a layer), `X` axis, or `Y` axis;
- Add or remove a field to/from grouping specification; and
- Modify the specification of a complex field by adding or removing an operation (such as $\times$ or $+$).

(In most systems, one can directly replace a field `A` with a field `B`. For technical reasons, we choose to model this action with two operations: removing `A` and then adding `B`.)

We use the Navigation Algebra to represent how users navigate between visualizations in a step-by-step fashion. Consider, for example, a user going from the visualization of Fig. 1(b) to that of Fig. 1(c). We can model this as a sequence of three data specifications, starting with
(lon, lat, { AVG (mag), SUM (nr), AVG (de) }, pl, -),
then removing depth, to obtain
(lon, lat, { AVG (mag), SUM (nr) }, pl, -),
and then removing the number of records, to arrive at
(lon, lat, { AVG (mag) }, pl, -),
which corresponds to the data specification of Fig. 1(c).

Sequences and Data-Slice Graphs: When working on a

[2] If two or more relations are to be visualized, one could join them and treat the result as a single relation to be visually represented. This is a common approach in commercial data-visualization systems.

[3] This is the way specifications are generated in, e.g., the Polaris prototype [27] of the Tableau software system [16].



(a) (b)

Fig. 4. (a) A data-slice graph for experimental task 1 of Section VII. Each graph node is shown using its (x, y, $grouping$, $filter$) values, with d = depth, d_{min} = minimum depth, lat = latitude, lon = longitude, m = magnitude, n = number of records, p = place, t = time, and . = no value. Edges define value transitions between nodes, with X = x, Y = y, grp = $grouping$, fltr = $filter$. In (b), the bottom-right fragment of the graph is shown at higher resolution.

visual-exploration or visual-analysis task, users create what we call sequences of visualizations: Starting at a particular visualization (such as that of Fig. 1(b)), a user can create new visualizations (such as the one of Fig. 2(a)), by performing operations made available to them by the user interface – e.g., filtering the data, adding an extra attribute to the data specification, or changing the type of visualization. Each subsequent operation produces a new visualization in the sequence, and users continue in this fashion until their task is complete.

Our goal is to suggest to the user the slice of the data whose visualization is appropriate for the current stage of the user's task on the data. Thus, we do not concentrate on those parts of the sequences where new visualizations are created by modifying the visual specification. Rather, we focus on the underlying sequence given by the changes in the data specifications. These changes are modeled using our Navigation Algebra as described above. Assuming that we have a log with visualization sequences generated by previous users, we construct what we call the *Data-Slice Graph* of this log: The nodes of this graph consist of all the data specifications occurring in the sequences in the log, and there is a directed edge from node D_1 to node D_2 if the log contains a sequence where D_1 and D_2 are consecutive data specifications.

As an example, Fig. 4(a) shows a data-slice graph for the task of finding outlier earthquakes in the data set [5] (Section I); this is task 1 in Section VII. The graph contains sequences generated by users who were solving the same type of task on the data set. Figure 4(b) depicts a fragment of the graph, showing nodes with IDs 14, 13, 8, 9, 23 and 24. Figure 4(b) was generated by the user sequence (D_8, D_9, D_{23}, D_{24}, D_{23}, D_8, D_{13}, D_{14}). The user started in node 8, with the specification D_8 = *(longitude, latitude, {}, place, -),* that is, assigning the earthquake longitude to the X axis, the latitude to the Y axis, and grouping by *place*. This specification corresponds to a visualization showing the map and just one dot for each place in that map where there has been at least one earthquake. (The grouping in D_8 means that all the earthquake events in the same vicinity are grouped into a single tuple.) The user then went on to add a filter on the attribute *magnitude*, to filter out places where the average magnitude is not high enough. Note that rather than storing the precise filter, D_8 stores just the fact that a filter was added. This allows us to store together all the data specifications with similar filters.

Continuing with the sequence, the user then added depth (node ID 23 with D_{23}) and minimum depth (24 and D_{24}). Then the depth was removed, resulting in node 23, and so on.

Interesting Nodes: Some of the sequences of visualizations in a log may contain data that are important for the user task. We denote these as *interesting* visualizations, and mark these nodes as *interesting nodes* in the data-slice graph.[4] For example, in our experiments with task 1 of Section VII, the nodes with IDs 9 and 23 in Fig. 4(b) were the most interesting to the human subjects. Since the data specification D_9 represents visualizations that are similar to that of Fig. 2(c), this confirms the intuition that the visualization in Fig. 2(c) is amongst the most informative for this type of task.

We distinguish between two types of users: *experts* and *regular users.* (This distinction is discussed in more detail in Section V-B.) We say that there is an *expert* (directed) edge from node D_1 to node D_2 if the sequence generating D_1 and D_2 was generated by an expert, and there is a *user* (directed) edge if it was generated by a regular user. In addition, for each edge of the form (D_1, D_2) we maintain with the edge the number of sequences in the log in which D_2 followed D_1.

B. Algorithms to Match and Rank Data Slices

The main focus of our framework is on servicing user requests to recommend the next task-relevant data slice and its appropriate visualization. To continue with our example, suppose that a user is exploring the earthquakes data set for magnitude outliers in Central America, and is currently looking at the visualization of Fig. 1(b). The data specification for Fig. 1(b), as discussed in Section IV-A, is
(lon, lat, { AVG (mag), SUM (nr), AVG (de) }, pl, -).
When the user asks for a recommendation, the system needs to perform the following two operations:

1. The data specification currently being examined by the user needs to be matched to data-specification nodes in the data-slice graph. We keep all such "best-match" nodes.

2. Once a match has been found, the system needs to find in the data-slice graph those "downstream" data specifications that are potentially interesting to the user and are at the same time the closest to the matched node, in terms of operations of the Navigation Algebra.

[4] In general, determining whether a visualization is interesting to a user is a nontrivial problem. While our framework can use any interestingness-measuring algorithm as a black box, in our experiments we marked as interesting all those visualizations which at least one user had visually examined for at least a fixed number of milliseconds.

The algorithm addressing the first challenge is called `Match Data Slices`, please see Algorithm 1 for the pseudocode. The algorithm accepts a data specification D and computes, for the stored data-slice graph G, the edit distance between D and the data specification in each node of G. (As mentioned in Section III, both this algorithm and the `Rank Data Slices` algorithm can use any distance measure, e.g., page rank. The edit distance shown in the pseudocode of `Match Data Slices` is one specific choice made in our implementation described in Section VI.) We do not want to differentiate between the specifications where the X and the Y axis are switched, as they represent semantically the same object, and likewise for switching between layers and axes. Thus, we proceed as follows. For each node n in the graph we compute three distances between n and D: (1) The edit distance d_s that considers only the fields assigned to the X and Y axes and the layers in D and n; (2) the edit distance d_g considering only the fields in the grouping clause; and (3) the edit distance d_f that considers only the filters in each of D and n. We then add the three values, and output all the nodes n in the graph for which the resulting value is the lowest.

We now look at addressing the second challenge listed above, making recommendations using the current match. Once we have matched a specification to a node in the data-slice graph, the next task is to retrieve the interesting "downstream" nodes in the graph that are the closest to the matched node. We do this using our `Rank Data Slices` algorithm, please see Algorithm 2 for the pseudocode. The algorithm works as follows. We assume that each node k in the data-slice graph is given an "interestingness" value I_k. (Any interestingness measure will work for our purposes, as outlined in Section III.) We are also given a threshold T, with the objective of selecting only those nodes with an interestingness value above T, as well as the desired number M of output nodes. For each node n that is in the output of `Match Data Slices`, we select all the nodes in the data-slice graph whose interestingness value is greater than the threshold T, and rank them in terms of their weighted-shortest-path distance to n. (Other distance measures could be used instead.) We then select and return the M nodes from this list that are closest to n; if there are not enough such nodes, we complete the list with the most interesting nodes overall according to the I-values in the graph. (This might be necessary if, for instance, the user's current visualization is not relevant to the task and thus cannot provide a useful input to the `Match` algorithm.)

In our experiments, as reported in Section VII, we chose screen time as our measure of interestingness of each data specification. (We assume there that the longer a user looks at the screen in examining a particular visualization, the more interesting that visualization is to the user.) We also set our threshold T to 3 seconds. Though it might look like a small value for the interestingness threshold, its effect is that of filtering out almost 70% of the graph nodes. Furthermore, in the experiments we considered the graph information that had originated from an expert as more helpful than the information from a regular user, and thus made the weight of expert edges in the graph *lower* (i.e., intuitively contributing to a shorter distance from the matched node) than the weight of "regular-user" edges. Specifically, the weight of an edge from a specification D to a specification D' that was part of an expert sequence would be set in the experiments to 1, and the weight of an edge from a regular-user sequence would be set to $1 + 1/n_u$, where n_u is the total count of previous users' sequences that have moved from D to D' in one step. Please see Section V-B for a discussion of expert and regular edges.

Algorithm 1: Match Data Slices

Given: Data-slice graph G and maximal number M of nodes in the output.
Input: Data specification D.
Output: The set of nodes of the data-slice graph G that is nearest to D in terms of edit distance.
for *each node* n *in* G **do**
  d_s = edit distance between the selection arguments of n and D;
  d_a = edit distance between the filters of n and D;
  d_g = edit distance between the grouping clauses of n and D;
  set $distance(n) = d_s + d_a + d_g$;
return *up to* M *nodes* n *in* G *with the lowest values of* $distance(n)$.

Algorithm 2: Rank Data Slices

Given: Data-slice graph G, maximal number of output nodes M, interestingness value I_k for each node k in G, and interestingness threshold T.
Input: A node n of the data-slice graph G.
Output: List of M interesting nodes closest to n.
$L = \emptyset$;
for *each node* m *in* G *with* $I_m > T$ **do**
  compute $distance(m) = weighted_shortest_path(n, m)$;
  if $distance(m) < infinity$ **then**
    $add\ m\ to\ L$;
Sort L according to distance (ascending);
if $size(L) >= M$ **then**
  return the M first nodes of L;
else
  add to L the $M - size(L)$ most interesting nodes in G according to I that are not in L;
return L.

Coming back to our example, recall that the specification of Fig. 1(b) was matched to the nodes 8 and 23 of the query graph. A call to `Rank Data Slices` will now try to find the most interesting specifications that are closest to these nodes. Intuitively, this can be understood as asking for the most interesting specifications that include the latitude and longitude, and thus are expected to be shown in a geographical representation. The ranking algorithm would return the two interesting nodes that are closest to either 8 or 23; these answers include 23 itself, with distance 0, and 9, with distance 1. To present these back to the user, we take these specifications and produce a visualization using the user's previous visual specification, which was a geographical representation. If we use the visual specification of Fig. 1(b), the visualization of the specification of node 9 would look like that of Fig. 2(c).

V. Constructing and Using Data-Slice Graphs

In this section we outline the process of constructing the data-slice graph for a given task type on a data set. Then we discuss the modes of using data-slice graphs depending on

whether domain experts have been involved in the construction.

A. The Construction Algorithm

Recall (Section I) that we assume that each user declares her task as she begins the work. Thus, each user sequence can be associated in the log with the task that the user was solving when generating the sequence. We also assume that each expert sequence (if any) is marked as such by the log administrator; we discuss the implications later in this section. At the point of logging a completed user sequence, we reformulate it, with two goals in mind. First, we make sure that all the logged sequences are formulated "at the same level of granularity." Toward this goal, we make each sequence detailed enough so that each edge in the output sequence corresponds to a single operation in the Navigation Algebra of Section IV-B (see Fig. 4(a) for an illustration of the outcome). The second goal is to mark, in each sequence, each node that is interesting under the given interestingness measure, see Sections III-B through IV-B for a discussion. The overall algorithm for this reformulation of user sequences is straightforward.

Suppose now that we have selected from the log all the sequences that are to be included in the data-slice graph that we are constructing. (We discuss potential selection criteria in Section V-B.) We begin the construction by declaring one arbitrary selected sequence as the (initial) data-slice graph. We then keep adding the other selected sequences to the graph one at a time, by combining each node in the current sequence with some node in the graph, as long as the two nodes are the same in the D part of their $Vis = \langle D, S \rangle$ representation. That is, we combine a node in a user sequence with a node in the graph if and only if the D parts of these nodes are the same; we store with each resulting node as many visual (S) specifications as we had in all the nodes that we have combined. If, on the other hand, for a node n in the sequence being added there are no nodes in the data-slice graph that have the same D part as n, we just add n as a new node in the graph. For each node we keep the maximum interestingness amongst all the sequences in which this node appeared. Once we have merged all the nodes of a sequence with the graph in this manner, we add to the graph all the edges belonging to the sequence being added. In the process, if the sequence being added is an expert sequence, we re-weigh its edges as described in the discussion of the `Rank Data Slices` algorithm in Section IV-B.

Output and Correctness: The output of the overall graph-construction algorithm is a data-slice graph constructed as described above. By definition of the algorithm, its output does not depend on the order in which the selected input sequences are processed and merged with the graph. The construction can be done either in the batch fashion or with the graph being enhanced over time in an incremental fashion, with addition of one user sequence at a time as needed.

B. Recommendation and Prediction Systems

We now discuss possible criteria for selecting logged user sequences for entry into the data-slice graph.

Recommendation Systems: One criterion could be to include all the sequences from the log that are associated with the task type of interest. (We consider two tasks on the same data set to be of the same type if they differ only in the filtering criteria. E.g., we declare to be of the same type the tasks "find all the magnitude-outlier earthquakes in the world" and "find all the magnitude-outlier earthquakes in Central America" on the data set [5], see Section III-A.) In this case, there is no need to mark user sequences as expert, and thus the entire process of constructing both the log and the data-slice graph as described in Section V-A can be fully automatic.



Fig. 5. The DataSlicer system architecture.

We call such a data-slice graph a *recommendation graph;* the overall DataSlicer system will function as a recommendation system in this case. The reason is, in this case we have no information on which nodes in the graph would be the most helpful to the users in prominently featuring correct solutions to their task. In working with such a graph, the users will possibly "upvote" over time those graph nodes that are more helpful to them in solving their task. This "upvoting" process is sound, as we assume (Section I) that each user can recognize correct solutions once they have been presented to her prominently in some visualization of the data. (The "upvoting" functionality can be easily added to the ranking algorithm of Section IV-B.) The resulting graph nodes can then be recalibrated automatically into more interesting nodes.

Prediction Systems: We now consider the case where the help of domain experts is available, or perhaps even sought after, as would be in case of mission-critical applications. Recall that the log administrator can mark some of the sequences to be logged as coming from domain experts. This can be done in case one or more experts on the domain, task type, and data set are involved in solving tasks of this type for the benefit of the user community; the community could be employees of a certain company, analysts using a certain product, and so on. In this case, the process of constructing the graph is the same as before (see Section V-A), with expert nodes and edges being marked explicitly as such in the construction.

When the DataSlicer system uses a data-slice graph constructed using expert sequences, we refer to this mode of operation as "prediction mode," and to the system as a "prediction system." Indeed, domain experts are expected to know how to solve effectively and efficiently tasks of the given type on the data set, and nodes and edges generated in the graph by their solutions are expected to help the community in solving tasks of the same type more so than sequences created by regular users. Note how our algorithm of Section V-A incorporates into a data-slice graph and automatically reconciles potentially different approaches of multiple experts to solving the same task. As a result, sequences coming from multiple experts get transformed into multiple solution paths in the graph.

VI. Putting It All Together

Fig. 5 depicts a high-level overview of the architecture of our system. In this section we outline it component by component, and then discuss the scalability and implementation.

Front End: The front end of the system can be any visualization tool, as long as it can issue appropriate data-specification queries on the data-set store and visualize the answers, and also has a means of communicating its operations to other software. Some commercial visualization systems make available logs of their operations; we have implemented DataSlicer with a commercially available front-end tool, in such a way that all the DataSlicer communication with the front end is done through such logs, as explained in the next paragraph.

Interface: The DataSlicer interface is the means to connect with the front-end visualization tool. The interface is in charge of the following two main tasks: First, it provides a way to obtain and understand logs of the system, to enable extracting from the logs information about previous-user sessions. This part of the interface is called the *log parser*; it also maintains the current user's current visual specification, as well as the data specifications returned by the ranking algorithm of Section IV-B. Second, once the system has recommended a set of data specifications, the interface visualizes them and presents them back to the user. To create these visualizations, we maintain the current user's previous visualization preferences and use them wherever possible to visualize the recommended data specifications. For those recommended data specifications that cannot be visualized using the current user's visual preferences, the system uses default visualization rules. Because of the closed architecture that many commercial visualization systems opt to implement, for our experiments we had to implement this second task in a semi-manual way.

Data-Slice Graph: The data-slice graph for the given task type and data set is physically stored as a separate database. We do not allow for any direct updates to the data-slice graph. Instead, to augment the data-slice graph with more information we set up separate system sessions, where past users sequences are provided to the log parser. During those sessions, the log parser enhances the existing data-slice graph with a new set of sequences, or creates a new data-slice graph from scratch, as detailed in Section V-A.

Back End: The back end of the system is the part that is in charge of producing recommendations for users. It comprises the Match and Rank algorithms, as described in Section IV-B.

Scalability: In the DataSlicer architecture, visualizations are constructed for users by separate front-end visualization software, which sends to the data store queries based on the data slices, and then visually postprocesses the query answers. Thus, in the overall DataSlicer system, the processing of data-slice queries is decoupled from executing the Match and Rank algorithms of Section IV-B on the data-slice graphs. Further, data-slice graphs are constructed based on task-exploration sequences, and thus on the structure rather than on the contents of the data set being explored. Thus, the size of a data-slice graph does not depend on the number of tuples of the data set, and the graph does not need to be modified as the contents of the data set change over time. On the other hand, the size of a data-slice graph is directly proportional to the number of user sequences that it captures, and the Match and Rank algorithms clearly run in at most linear time with respect to the size of the graph. Addressing the issue of scalability of Match and Rank in the number of user sequences in the data-slice graph is a direction of our current work.

The Implementation for the Experiments: The system used for the experiments reported in Section VII has been built using the Java framework and compiled using JDK 1.8. To store the data-slice graphs for the experiments, we used MongoDB version 2.2. We worked with a commercial visualization tool; we can support working with any visualization tool, but for each different visualization tool, a different DataSlicer interface needs to be built. (This includes the log parser and the connection that presents visualizations back to the user.)

VII. Experimental Results

To evaluate DataSlicer's recommendation performance, we conducted a set of controlled experiments. The results were evaluated in terms of the measures of (see [13], [14]) *participant speed,* understood as the average number of data-specification steps taken to find a correct visualization for the task, as well as of *result accuracy,* understood as the degree to which the participant's solution is close to the correct solution. (In our experiments, the correct solutions were determined as part of the experimental setup.) Following the experiments, each participant completed a questionnaire to capture their perception of: (1) the difficulty of the assigned task, (2) the correctness of their solution, (3) the correctness of the system's solution, and (4) the overall usefulness of DataSlicer.

Both the statistical and questionnaire results were positive. Specifically, the results suggest that DataSlicer provides technically correct visualizations and, perhaps more importantly, rapidly directs participants to a correct visualization, potentially improving their performance over time.

Due to the page limit, some of the discussions in this section are omitted. All of the omitted information can be found in the full version [1] of this paper.

A. The Procedure

We conducted four sets of experiments involving 48 human participants, with 12 participants randomly assigned to each of the four separate groups. The participants were graduate students ranging in age from 21 to 34, with 31 males and 17 females, each with normal or corrected to normal vision.

Each of the 48 participants was first trained to work with our choice of front-end visualization software, and was then given a task to complete. The tasks focused on common data-analytics concepts of finding outliers and general data trends.

After the initial training, each participant was asked to complete their assigned task without using DataSlicer. The resulting log files were analyzed for comparison with DataSlicer's recommended "correct" visualization. Next, the participants used DataSlicer to find additional solutions for the same task, on the same data set. We then compared the accuracy and speed for the participants' task completion with and without access to DataSlicer. The participants concluded their session by providing feedback via a questionnaire (see [1]).

The data sets used in the experiments are summarized in Table I, and the experimental results are given in Table II. Please note that the data sets (Table I) were small in size. Still, we found (Table II) that our human participants had difficulty completing the assigned tasks even on these small data sets. Presumably, increasing the number of observations would further degrade the users' unassisted performance.

Name	Position	Age	BA
Melky Mesa	UT	25	0.50
Derek Jeter	SS	38	0.32
Andy Pettitte	P	40	0.25
Francisco Cervelli	C	26	0.00
Chris Dickerson	OF	30	0.29
Brett Gardner	LF	28	0.32
Rabinson Cano	2B	29	0.31
Eric Chavez	DH	34	0.28

(a) Fragment of data set [6] for task 2



(b) Box plot showing prominently answers (outliers) for task 2 on data set [6]

Fig. 6. Experimental task 2 using data set [6]: fragment of the data set and a visual solution that shows prominently the answers to the task.

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
China	375	430	430	545	545	545
France	886	1148	1148	1248	1248	1248
Germany	765	765	765	887	937	937
Italy	1217	1217	1217	1231	1231	1245
Japan	957	957	957	957	957	970
Netherlands	1005	1005	1005	1020	942	942
United Kingdom	1267	1267	1267	1350	1160	1045
United States	1160	1160	1160	1245	1315	1315

(a) Import costs ($ / container) in 2005–2010 in [7]



(b) Diagram showing prominently answers (trend outliers) for task 3 on data [7]

Fig. 7. Experimental task 3 using data set [7]: fragment of the data set and a visual solution that shows prominently the answers to the task.

	2000	2001	2002	2003
Export	279.56	299.41	365.40	485.00
Import	250.69	271.33	328.01	448.92
	2004	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**
Export	655.83	836.90	1061.68	1342.21
Import	606.54	712.09	852.77	1034.73
	2008	**2009**	**2010**	
Export	1581.71	1333.30	1752.10	
Import	1232.84	1113.20	1520.33	

(a) Export and import values for China (top country in urban population) in billion US$ in 2000–2010 in data set [7]



(b) Line diagram showing prominently answers (import/export trends) for the top country in urban population in 2000-2010, for task 4 on data [7]

Fig. 8. Experimental task 4 using data set [7]: fragment of the data set and a visual solution that shows prominently the answers to the task.

Data set	Observations	Attributes
Earthquakes [5]	8289	17 attributes: Time, Date & Time, Longitude, Latitude, Depth, Magnitude, Magnitude type, Nst, Gap, Dmin, Rms, Net, ID, Updated, Place, Type, Occurrences
Baseball [6]	495	10 attributes: Name, Position, Type, AB, Age, BA, BB, G, H, RK
Economic [7]	2376	11 attributes: Country Name, Date, Exports, Imports, Cost to Import, Health Expenditure per Capita, Urban Population, Latitude, Longitude, Population Total, Health Expenditure Total

TABLE I. THE DATA SETS, NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS, AND NUMBER AND NAMES OF ATTRIBUTES FOR THE FOUR EXPERIMENTAL TASKS.

B. The Tasks

Each participant was asked to perform one of the four different tasks, both with and without assistance from DataSlicer: (1) locating spatial outliers in an earthquakes data set [5]; (2) locating data outliers in a baseball data set [6]; (3) locating outlier patterns and trends in an economic data set [7]; and (4) recognizing the general trends in the (same) data set [7]. The experiments were designed to cover common analytical tasks performed across a wide range of data domains; the tasks and data sets used in the experiments are as provided by [16].

The expert sequences for each task were generated and validated as part of the experimental setup. The experts' log files were retrieved from the front-end visualization tool, parsed, and integrated into DataSlicer as discussed in Section V-A.

Performance-Improvement Ratios for Users over Tasks 1-4			
	Minimum	Maximum	Average
Accuracy-Improvement Ratios	1.84	16.9	5.09
Speed-Improvement Ratios	3.19	8.45	6.34

(a)

Average (μ) User Speed per Task, in Visualization Steps Taken to Solve Task				
Average speed (in visualization steps)	Task 1 *(earthquake)*	Task 2 *(baseball)*	Task 3 *(economic)*	Task 4 *(economic)*
Without DataSlicer	17.1	16.9	16.0	12.75
With DataSlicer	3	2	2	4

(b)

Average (μ) user accuracy per task	Task 1		Task 2				Task 3	Task 4
	"occurrence" (# outliers found)	*"magnitude" (#* outliers found)	*"position" (#* attributes found)	*"position" (#* outliers found)	*"type" (#* attributes found)	*"type" (#* outliers found)	*(# outliers* in trends)	*Correct visualization* achieved (% cases)
Without DataSlicer	4.9	9.9	0.58	0.17	0.42	0.92	0.5	50
With DataSlicer	83	30	2	1	1	3	2	92

(c)

TABLE II. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS: (A) PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENTS, REPORTED FOR ACCURACY AS (WITH DATASLICER)/(WITHOUT DATASLICER) RATIOS, AND FOR SPEED AS (WITHOUT DATASLICER)/(WITH DATASLICER) RATIOS; (B) AVERAGE SPEED VALUES ACROSS THE TASKS; (C) AVERAGE USER-ACCURACY VALUES ACROSS THE TASKS.

Task 1: Spatial Outliers. This task used an earthquakes data set [5] containing the location of 8,289 earthquakes with magnitude 6 or greater throughout the world, from 1900 to 2013 (Table I). The participants were asked to find *places* (locations) on the map that contain earthquakes with either: (1) outlier *magnitudes;* or (2) outlier *number of occurrences*. (The definitions of outliers, via inter-quartile ranges, are "as expected" and can be found in [1].)

Task 2: Local Data Outliers. This task used a baseball data set [6] containing information on 45 baseball players from the 2012 Major League Baseball season (Table I). The participants were asked to find the data points for players that were outliers based on a specific *position* or *type*. E.g., a participant could look for outlier players at the shortstop position by finding all shortstop players, then search for outliers within that subgroup. If a data point contained any attribute that was an outlier relative to the other players *in the subgroup* (hence the name "*local* data outliers"), then that player would be reported as an outlier. (The definitions of outlier values, via inter-quartile ranges, are "as expected" and can be found in [1].)

Task 3: Outliers in Economic Patterns. This task used a World Bank indicators data set [7] containing 11 economic, health, and population attributes for 216 countries for the years 2000–2010 (Table I). The participants were asked to identify the top eight countries in terms of average *exports*, then determine which of these countries displayed an outlier pattern in terms of *export* statistics over the given years. Outliers are identified by differences in the direction of the slope of their trend lines versus the overall norm for a given attribute.

Task 4: General Economic Patterns. This task used the same data set [7] as Task 3. The participants were asked to identify a visualization that showed the similarities and dissimilarities between the *export* and *import* trends for the top country in the *urban population* category over the years 2000 to 2010.

C. Expert Solutions

We now discuss the steps that were used by experts to solve tasks 3–4. (Due to the page limit, expert solutions for tasks 1–2 can be found in the full version [1] of the paper; Fig. 2(c) and Fig. 6(b) show the respective visualizations obtained by expert users to present the answers to the tasks.)

Task 3. Identifying *export* pattern outliers in the World Bank indicators data set [7] involved two stages. First, the top eight countries in terms of average *exports* were filtered by setting a lower *export* bound to include only eight countries. Next, a line-graph visualization of each country's *exports* over the years 2000 to 2010 was generated. The countries whose trend lines deviated in slope from the norm (*i.e.,* the trend lines that did not follow the ascending or descending pattern of the norm) were deemed to be outliers (Fig. 7(b)).

Task 4. Recognizing general patterns in *import* and *export* data for the top *urban population* country in the World Bank indicators data set [7] involved two stages. First, the top *urban population* country in 2000–2010 was identified by setting a lower bound on *urban population* as a filter. Next, a line diagram was generated on *imports* and *exports* over these years. The resulting visualization contains the top country's trends for both *imports* and *exports* (Fig. 8(b)).

D. The Results

The average results for accuracy (either the number of solutions found or the indicator of whether the single correct solution was found) and for speed (the number of query steps performed), both without and with assistance from DataSlicer, are detailed in Table II. Based on the average values in Table II, the accuracy of user solution for all tasks is at least 1.84 times better with DataSlicer than without DataSlicer, with the average of 5.09. Moreover, the speed in obtaining final visualization is at least 3 times better with DataSlicer than without DataSlicer, with the average of 6.34.

We used Welch's analysis of variance (ANOVA) [31] to search for significant differences between the participant performance with and without assistance from DataSlicer. Based on this analysis, we determined that in each of the four tasks, the participants were in statistically significant ways both faster[5] and more accurate[6] with help from DataSlicer than without the help. (Due to the page limit, the report on the detailed statistics is omitted from this paper; the report can be found in the full version of the paper [1].)

Based on these results, we conclude that DataSlicer allows participants to find statistically significantly more outliers and trends, in significantly fewer data-specification steps, than unaided exploration. The tasks assigned to the participants include spatial outliers, local outliers, trend outliers, and general trends, which represent common analytic tasks on real data. Thus, the improved accuracy and speed in our experiments

[5]Increased speed here means that fewer data-specification operations were required with DataSlicer than without, to identify a correct visualization.

[6]Better accuracy here means that more outliers were located with DataSlicer than without, and general trends were located with DataSlicer but not without.

suggest better accuracy and speed for real-world data analysis.

The questionnaire results (see [1]) were also positive. On a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being lowest and 7 highest, the participants rated the usefulness of DataSlicer as 5.44, on average, and the accuracy of DataSlicer as 5.94, on average. The participants were more confident about their answers with DataSlicer than without (5.88 versus 5.46, on average).

VIII. Conclusions

Searching for outlier data elements, data patterns, and trends are common and critical tasks during visual analytics. The value of visualizations is in their offering the ability to present data in ways that leverage a user's domain expertise, knowledge of context, and ability to manage ambiguity that fully automated systems cannot. At the same time, users are often overwhelmed by the sheer volume of data (even in small data sets such as that [5] of experimental task 1 in Section VII), which may prevent them from understanding even basic properties of their data sets. This becomes particularly important in situations where the data set is large.

In our experiments with four task types designed to be representative of real-time exploration and discovery, DataSlicer significantly improved both the accuracy and speed for identifying spatial outliers, data outliers, outlier patterns, and general trends. The system quickly predicted what a participant was searching for based on their initial operations, then presented recommendations that allowed the participants to transform the data, leading them to identification of the desired solutions.

Although our data sets were moderate in size, the human participants had difficulty completing the assigned tasks on the data. Presumably, increasing the size of data would further degrade their performance, and therefore strengthen the value of using DataSlicer. As discussed in Section VI, our predictive sequence comparisons are relatively insensitive to data-set size, depending most directly on the number of expert sequences to match against. In the scenarios that we have tested, larger data sets would lead to more target observations (e.g., outliers identified), but not to more steps required to find the targets. In this way, we address an important goal of scalability: With predictions based on user-generated sequences, the prediction cost is based on the number of sequences and sequence length, and not on data-set size.

We have run separate preliminary experiments with a "recommendation" data-slice graph involving only regular-user sequences from our original experiments with task 1 of Section VII. The outcomes, discussed in [1], were far from satisfactory, as no graph nodes were of significant help to users in their solving the task with DataSlicer. This confirms the intuition that such tasks are very difficult to solve for users that are not experts in their fields, therefore reinforcing the desirability of constructing data-slice graphs using expert sequences. It remains to be seen if recommendation graphs can be useful tools for simpler tasks or with significantly larger user bases.

References

[1] F. Alborzi, S. Chaudhuri, and et al. DataSlicer: Enabling data selection for visual data exploration. Technical Report TR-2015-8, NCSU, 2015. `http://www.csc.ncsu.edu/research/tech/reports.php`.

[2] U. Cetintemel, M. Cherniack, J. DeBrabant, Y. Diao, K. Dimitriadou, A. Kalinin, O. Papaemmanouil, and S. Zdonik. Query steering for interactive data exploration. In *CIDR*, 2013.

[3] G. Chatzopoulou, M. Eirinaki, and N. Polyzotis. Query recommendations for interactive database exploration. *Scientific and Statistical Database Management*, pages 3–18, 2009.

[4] K. Dimitriadou, O. Papaemmanouil, and Y. Diao. Explore-by-example: An automatic query steering framework for interactive data exploration. In *ACM SIGMOD*, pages 517–528, 2014.

[5] Dropbox. https://www.dropbox.com/s/hye4pi82wcwsrrp/CDWT_ch7_Earthquakes.xlsx. Accessed in February 2015.

[6] Dropbox. https://www.dropbox.com/s/eflow6vsmgbulk5/CDWT_ch5_2012NYStats.xlsx. Accessed in February 2015.

[7] Dropbox. https://www.dropbox.com/s/jym44gtqni2qddf/Sample%20-%20World%20Bank%20Indicators.xlsx. Accessed in February 2015.

[8] M. Drosou and E. Pitoura. Ymaldb: exploring relational databases via result-driven recommendations. *VLDBJ*, 22:849–874, 2013.

[9] J. Fan, G. Li, and L. Zhou. Interactive SQL query suggestion: Making databases user-friendly. In *ICDE*, pages 351–362, 2011.

[10] D. Gotz and Z. Wen. Behavior-driven visualization recommendation. *Proc. Intl' Conf. Intelligent User Interfaces*, pages 315–324, 2009.

[11] L. Grammel, M. Tory, and M Storey. How information visualization novices construct visualizations. *IEEE Trans. Visualiz. and Comp. Graph.*, 16(6):943–952, 2010.

[12] C. G. Healey and B. M. Dennis. Interest driven navigation in visualization. *IEEE Trans. Visualiz. and Comp. Graph.*, 18:1744–1756, 2012.

[13] C. G. Healey and J. T. Enns. Attention and visual memory in visualization and computer graphics. *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graph.*, 18(7):1170–1188, 2012.

[14] C. G. Healey and A. P. Sawant. On the limits of resolution and visual angle in visualization. *ACM Trans. Applied Perception*, 9(4):20, 2012.

[15] S. Idreos, O. Papaemmanouil, and S. Chaudhuri. Overview of data exploration techniques. In *ACM SIGMOD*, pages 277–281, 2015.

[16] Ben Jones. *Communicating Data with Tableau*. O'Reilly Media, 2014.

[17] A. Key, B. Howe, D. Perry, and C. Aragon. Vizdeck: self-organizing dashboards for visual analytics. In *ACM SIGMOD*, 2012.

[18] N. Khoussainova, Y. Kwon, M. Balazinska, and D. Suciu. SnipSuggest: Context-aware autocompletion for SQL. *PVLDB*, 4(1):22–33, 2010.

[19] M. Livny, R. Ramakrishnan, K. S. Beyer, G. Chen, D. Donjerkovic, S. Lawande, J. Myllymaki, and R. K. Wenger. DEVise: Integrated querying and visual exploration of large datasets. In *ACM SIGMOD*, pages 517–520, 1997.

[20] J. D. Mackinlay, P. Hanrahan, and C. Stolte. Show Me: Automatic presentation for visual analysis. *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graph.*, 13(6):1137–1144, 2007.

[21] P. Neophytou, R. Gheorghiu, R. Hachey, T. Luciani, D. Bao, A. Labrinidis, E. Marai, and P. Chrysanthis. AstroShelf: understanding the universe through scalable navigation of a galaxy of annotations. In *ACM SIGMOD*, pages 713–716, 2012.

[22] F. Niu, C. Zhang, C. Re, and J. Shavlik. DeepDive: Web-scale knowledge-base construction using statistical learning and inference. In *Proc. Intl' Wkshp Searching Integrating New Web Data Sources*, 2012.

[23] A. Parameswaran, N. Polyzotis, and H. Garcia-Molina. SeeDB: Visualizing database queries efficiently. *PVLDB*, 7(4):325–328, 2013.

[24] T. Sellam and M. Kersten. Meet Charles, big data query advisor. In *CIDR*, 2013.

[25] J. Shin, S. Wu, F. Wang, C. De Sa, C. Zhang, and C. Ré. Incremental knowledge base construction using DeepDive. *PVLDB*, 8, 2015.

[26] C. Stolper, A. Perer, and D. Gotz. Progressive visual analytics: User-driven visual exploration of in-progress analytics. *IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graph.*, 20(12):1653–1662, 2014.

[27] C. Stolte. *Query, analysis, and visualization of multidimensional databases*. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2003.

[28] C. Stolte, D. Tang, and P. Hanrahan. Polaris: a system for query, analysis, and visualization of multidimensional databases. *Comm. ACM*, 51(11):75–84, 2008.

[29] M. Vartak, S. Madden, A. Parameswaran, and N. Polyzotis. SeeDB: automatically generating query visualizations. *PVLDB*, 7(13), 2014.

[30] A. Wasay, M. Athanassoulis, and S. Idreos. Queriosity: Automated data exploration. In *Proc. IEEE International Congress on Big Data*, 2015.

[31] B. L. Welch. On the comparison of several mean values: An alternative approach. *Biometrika*, 3/4:330–336, 1951.